

Honorable Julius Genachowski, Chairman

Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Commissioner Robert M. McDowell

Commissioner Mignon Clyburn

Commissioner Meredith Attwell Baker

Federal Communications Commission

445 Twelfth Street SW

Washington, DC 20554

Re: CG Docket Nos. 03-123 and 10-51

Dear Chairman Genachowski and Commissioners Copps, McDowell, Clyburn, and Baker,

As an employee of a Video Relay Service (VRS) provider, I have the great fortune of assisting deaf individuals to communicate by videophone in American Sign Language using VRS. This is the most rewarding job I have ever done, and the best way that I have seen services be provided for the deaf in my whole lifetime. I have seen first-hand that this life-altering broadband service is a vital link that connects deaf people to the hearing community.

Ensuring that deaf individuals have access to VRS and encouraging improvements in VRS should be a high priority for you as Chairman and Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). If you ever saw what VRS relay provided - how successfully EQUAL ACCESS is provided for deaf individuals, you would MARVEL at how an entire community of people who have been "behind the eight ball and out-of-the-loop? for communication are on a level playing field. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires the FCC to make available to all deaf individuals nationwide ?functionally-equivalent? communications. The multitude of years that I have exposure and

knowledge of the deaf community had always left me saddened by the UNEqual access provided to those individuals. VRS changed that completely. Isolation? (and ironically, Alexander Graham Bell's invention of the phone un-isolated hearing people. It connected them?) and at the same time isolated the deaf community. VRS finally gave visual communication back to those people. TTY was a crippled communication method comparatively.

You will soon determine the future of VRS. When you set the VRS rate, you will determine whether America makes progress toward the statutory goals of functional equivalence, nationwide access and inclusion ? or force deaf users to revert to TTY communications, which are antiquated, forcing deaf users to work in their second (or third language) and it is interminably slower. And, you will determine whether VRS fulfills its potential to drive broadband adoption by the deaf, even in the face of poverty and isolation.

I was deeply disturbed to see the Commission's recent Public Notice on VRS rates. These proposals would put an end to VRS as we know it. My employer has already informed me that if these proposed rates are adopted, our company would head into bankruptcy. This would be disastrous for deaf VRS users.

The FCC should be increasing the availability and use of VRS, not cutting back. You should adopt a rate that encourages continuing improvements in VRS technology and continues to improve services levels. Recent developments in VRS are a good example of how the service can be improved, such as enhanced 911 services, 10-digit numbering, a larger and better-trained pool of interpreters and better videophones with an array of enhanced features. Monthly payments for broadband are a big expense for many deaf people, and instead of trying to cut back on VRS, you should be exploring ways to make VRS over broadband more affordable to deaf individuals.

Progress towards functional equivalence will be destroyed if the FCC does not encourage VRS providers to improve VRS and make it more widely available. VRS is a recent and dramatic advancement that benefits those who are deaf, but so much more can be done. It would be tragic if the FCC were to destroy this broadband service that is so vital to the deaf.

Recent reports of fraud in the VRS industry are disturbing to employees who work for a company that has operated within current FCC guidelines and has worked to maintain the integrity of the VRS fund. The FCC must devote more of its time and energy to focusing on the elimination of fraud. The rates for VRS proposed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in its April 30 Public Notice would be a disaster for VRS because ?

? The rates are so low that it would be the end of VRS as we know it today. No provider would seek to provide VRS at the low rates proposed by the FCC;

? The FCC proposes a low interim VRS rate. A better option would be a multi-year VRS rate, which would allow VRS providers to continue to invest in their offerings for the deaf.

? VRS and the improvements made to it over the years have moved us closer to the goal of ?function equivalence? mandated by the Americans with Disabilities Act. The FCC rate proposal would destroy that progress and move us further from achieving the goals of the ADA; My employer has informed me that this rate proposal would lead our company into bankruptcy, leaving our deaf customers without the vital VRS service they have come to expect;

? This proposal would almost certainly mean that my job and countless others would be in jeopardy in an economy where finding a new job would be extremely difficult, if not impossible.

I urge you to establish a FAIR and predictable rate for VRS that will encourage VRS providers to invest in improving VRS and reaching more deaf individuals. The law requires it and it is THE RIGHT THING TO DO.

Regards,

Annie Haynes